

### III. REMARKS

Claims 1 and 4-22 are pending in this application. By this preliminary amendment, claims 1, 8, 13 and 18 have been amended and claim 4 has been cancelled. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. In response, Applicants submit that paragraphs 0026 and 0027 of the original disclosure provide support for the limitation “wherein at least one of the desired interactivity metrics provided by the potential user measures an interactivity between users unrelated to a content of information posted in the collaborative space.” Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims contain subject matter which is described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In the Office Action, claims 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Office asserts that the limitation “a computerized system” can be software per se. In response, Applicants have amended claims 13-17 to now recite, *inter alia*, “a computer implemented system having at least one computer for analyzing a collaborative space, including.” Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 13-17 are not software per se and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

In the Office Action, claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Netscan (<http://web.archive.org/web/20021001103129/netscan.research.microsoft.com/Static/Default.asp>), hereinafter “Netscan.” Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection in light of the following remarks.

With respect to amended claim 1, Applicants submit that Netscan fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, including “categorizing the collaborative space into a group based on the interactivity metrics, wherein the group identifies a subset of collaborative spaces from a set of collaborative spaces.” (See claim 1 and as similarly recited by claims 8, 13 and 18). Interpreting Netscan only for the purposes of this response, Applicants submit that Netscan fails to group and identify a subset of collaborative spaces. Instead, Netscan teaches a number of newsgroups, for example, that may be sorted in an ascending or descending order. If a user clicks on the metric for “number of posts,” all of the newsgroups are simply re-ranked. However, Netscan fails to provide a subset of collaborative spaces when the user clicks on the metric. In contrast, in the claimed invention, a subset of collaborative spaces is identified from all of the collaborative spaces as being appropriate for recommendation. Instead of simply listing all of the collaborative spaces in a modified order, the claimed invention categorizes a portion of the collaborative spaces based on the needs of potential users. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Netscan fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1 and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection. Since similar amendments have been made to independent claims 8, 13 and 18, withdrawal of the rejection of those claims is also requested.

With respect to all of the dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The

10/730,247 Page 10 of 11

dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Darrell. Pogue/

Darrell L. Pogue

Reg. No.: 57,878

Date: April 19, 2007

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC  
75 State Street 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 449-0044  
(518) 449-0047 (fax)